



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Contrary to the opinion expressed by several of the early chroniclers, that the study of French at this time was only a matter of fashion, our editor holds that it was rather the practical use of it which caused the production of methods for teaching it, and very appropriately observes that the caprices of mere fashion-seekers are not likely to continue thus uninterrupted through several centuries.

The *Orthographia Gallica* was written by an Englishman, between 1250 and 1350, in order to regulate, according to French models, the orthography of the Anglo-Norman, which had a strong tendency at that time to shape itself more and more after the popular pronunciation. The topics, therefore, that are naturally insisted upon most by the author are the differences between the Anglo-Norman pronunciation and that of the French proper, considered from an English point of view.

The editor, in accordance with this idea, divides the material of the work into three categories: (1) where differences between Anglo-Norman and French orthography are discussed; (2) where cases of varying French orthography are given; (3) where examples of only Latin orthography are touched upon, and general rules laid down for the same in original documents.

Two examples will suffice to illustrate the importance of this publication, with reference to the history of the graphic signs used to represent the same sound at different periods of the language.

Rule XII stands: *que vel qui consuevit olim scribi cum k, sed apud modernos commutatur k in q*, and, following up this canon, the editor shows that the author's "*olim*" must have been the beginning of the thirteenth century, the *Blüthezeit* of *ki* and *ke*, which first came into use after the middle of the twelfth century, and that after 1281 *qui que, qi qe* are almost exclusively found.

Rule XV prescribes that *gn* and not *ngn* should be written in *besoignes*, *signifiant* and their like, and in explanation of this change it is shown that the appearance of the triple combination belongs to the beginning of the thirteenth century, during which period, as well as during the following century, Anglo-Norman documents contain plenty of examples of it. It is found, furthermore, in the Latin of the late Empire period, and also in Dauphiné cartularies of the thirteenth century, but not in the oldest French manuscripts. Here the binary compound was the rule.

The notes are excellent and judiciously distributed, with so extensive bibliographical references that they often make the historical study of the different subjects covered by the phonetic rules easy, from the earliest published references to them down to the present time.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Encyklopaedie und Methodologie der Romanischen Philologie, mit Besonderer Berücksichtigung des Französischen und Italienischen, von GUSTAV KÖRTING. Zweiter Theil: Die Encyklopaedie der Romanischen Gesamt-Philologie. Heilbronn, Henninger, 1884. xviii, 505 S.

We have here a portly octavo volume of over five hundred pages, following close upon Part I of the same work, noticed in No. 17 of this Journal. In the first issue the author confined himself to preliminary notions touching the

relation of language to thought, to the non-dependence of written sign on phonetic product, to the development and classification of speech-forms and the growth of literature, to the general conception of philology, with its extensive reach and divers limitations according to the nature of individual languages, and to broad characteristics of a methodology of the Romance languages. In the much more important work before us he confines himself to the Romance group, and divides the immense mass of material treated into two great categories; (1) that of a purely linguistic character; (2) the literary matter belonging to this department of philology as a whole. Under the first heading are classified all the general varying conditions of sound and word—the production, constitution, development, and assortment of the one; the formation, relations of the parts, and history of the other—to which is appropriately added a short supplement on characteristic phrase-building, style, and special Romance speech history.

Under the second division he ranges literary works, according to both their outer and inner history, their particular form, their sources, the mode of their interpretation (text-criticism and exegesis), and, finally, according to groupings, into distinct sets that belong to the domain of Romance literary expression only.

The purely philological part covers about two-thirds of the book, which the author originally proposed to accompany by a sort of annals of Romance philology. These were to contain a list of all the most important works on the language, arranged in chronological order, that have appeared in the several departments of this subject, and in addition, a system of biographical data touching the principal Romance scholars of to-day, the founding of professorships, of associations for neo-Latin studies, etc. After this material had been collected, however, the author found that it was too great in amount and varied in kind to be hung on to his already large volume, and he therefore promises us the whole of it at an early date, recast and developed into a "History of Romance Philology." While every scholar who is working in this field will be rejoiced to have the suggestion of such a history, it must be doubted whether, at this early stage in the growth of the subject, such an attempt may not be premature. Of course the writer would propose to confine himself, in great measure, to the French, since the materials for a survey of the remaining Neo-Latin idioms are not yet at hand. But, however incomplete such a review would seem for the non-gallic branches of the Romance stock, it would have the merit, at least, of showing what an extraordinary development the French domain has had within the last ten to fifteen years, and no one else, perhaps, is more capable of putting us *au courant* with all the different stages of growth which this young science has passed through, than the author of this, our first veritable encyclopaedia of Romance philology.

The second volume (Zweiter Theil) of this work is a model of comprehensive statement, of characterisation of detail, of clear, well-defined method, and shows a range of reading that must impress every one who is at all acquainted with the general run of it, as little less than wonderful. This is particularly true of the phonology and morphology, where the former will be of special interest to the student as a résumé of the most advanced ideas upon this subject, and as thus forming a sort of handbook, which may be taken for a reliable guide

in the puzzling complexity of material that is encountered in an introduction to this branch of linguistics.

The physiological basis of all voice-products is here stated with succinctness, and duly insisted upon as the keynote to any system of sound-study, and the reach of phonetic law is thus shown to depend upon the varying conditions of nature, where the unerring principle of "survival of the fittest" and of "least action" determine the final results.

For his treatment of the vowel-system, our author shows himself conservative and unwilling, as yet, to accept Boehmer's hypothesis,¹ with reference to the development in Romance of the Latin vowels, that is, it depends exclusively on the quality of the original vowel. Before the announcement of this theory, it was the quantity of the vowel that was considered the basis of change. Koerting, following ten Brink,² would make both quantity and quality essential conditions to Romance types, and he does not stand here, therefore, upon a plane of purely practical interchange of elements between the Latin and the modern idioms, such as we have it in Diez' Grammatik and in Scheler's *Lois Phonétiques*. When the former wrote his celebrated work on Romance grammar, such a thing as the science of phonology can scarcely be said to have existed, and hence we find this part of his work one of the specially weak points in it. Little or no attention was then paid to the physiological production of sound as the foundation upon which all correct principles rest in the differentiation of phonetic categories. Hence it was that a natural but false starting point was chosen from which the intricate and perplexing relations of Romance sounds were studied. Latin quantity was transferred to the Neo-Latin tongues, though they are essentially accent languages, and the growth of French phonetic products was conditioned by the double circumstance of quantity and position. The theory, therefore, of Boehmer was radical in its tendency and was considered epoch-making by some of the leading Romance scholars.³ Among those who have advocated the same, or slightly modified tenets, with reference to relation of quality and quantity in the Latin, we must note Schuchardt,⁴ of the University of Graz; Suchier,⁵ of Halle; Gaston Paris,⁶ of the Collège de France; who maintain that vowels do not undergo changes according to their quantity exclusively, but according to their sound, in other words, that the quality of Romance vowels is independent, in great measure at least, of the quantity of their Latin prototypes; and that the long vowel of the Latin metre represented a closed sound, while the short one was open, as, for example, is evidenced in the discrimination of the present from the perfect in such forms as *venit (apertum)*, *venit (clausum)*; furthermore, that the quantity of the Latin vowels was not a stable factor, and hence, for this very reason, they could not have had any constant influence on the development of the Romance vowels. These views are shared by the author of our *Encyklopaedie* in so far only as they bear upon the quality of the long and short vowels, that is, length was invariably bound up with the clausum, and shortness with the

¹ Klang, nicht Dauer, *Romanische Studien*, III 351-66 et 609-16.

² Klang und Dauer, Strassburg, 1879.

³ Groeber, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, III 146-8.

⁴ Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins, I 471, et *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, IV 140.

⁵ *Zeitschr. f. Rom. Phil.* III 135.

⁶ *Romania*, X 39.

apertum, but he is distinctly separated from his colleagues, when he holds for the Latin that, with a given difference of quantity, there was always united a certain difference of quality. For the question, however, as to which of these elements predominated in the production and coloring of the Romance vowel, it is impossible to determine, from the simple fact that the two conditions of length and shortness, shutness and openness, are never found separated, nor can the one be eliminated without destroying the other.

For the morphology we find here less innovation upon the works of his predecessors than in the phonology. The principal reason for this lies in the condition of the subject itself as a theme for modern treatment. Diez was not strong at the ends of his line of grammatical investigation, that is, in phonology and syntax, but in morphology he not only holds his own, but continues to offer the best representation of the entire system that has ever been given us, in face of the rapid advance in the treatment of special topics.

In entering upon this division of his subject, the author is careful to insist upon what he considers the legitimate province of an Encyclopaedia, namely, it is to give a general view of the flexions according to the light of recent investigation, and not to discuss the probability of divers theories with reference to special, technical questions. Contrary to general custom, but in accordance with the logical order of grammar categories, he then begins by placing the article in its natural word-class, the demonstrative pronouns, and after a clear statement of the principle which underlies a scientific arrangement of the Latin declension he goes forward to show why the accusative in particular was taken as the typical form for a vast majority of the Romance substantives, especially in the singular, while in the plural the Eastern group (Italian and Wallachian) draws its characteristics from the Latin nominative, and the remaining languages (Spanish, Portuguese, Mod. French, Mod. Provençal, and Raetian) stick to the traditions of the singular accusative. This generalisation, of course, does not cover the Old French and Old Provençal, which had their system of declension developed regularly out of the Latin both with and without change of accent.

For the verb, it is the flexions that offer the greatest deviation from the old system and show better than anything else the progress made in tracing the original types that produced them. That the modern forms should have become complex and difficult to trace is thought no wonder, when we bear in mind that not a single verb in the whole domain of Romance speech has built all its parts according to one and the same conjugational type. The A-conjugation has been preserved with the greatest fidelity, but even here we frequently find a mixing with other conjugations, as, for example, in Italian *amiamo*, produced by analogy with the I-conj. *sentiamo*, which, again, in its turn has the flexional *a* of the A-conj. So, too, the French *aimons* probably does not = *amamus*, which would have produced **aimains* (cf. *les mains* = *manus*), but comes from a type **amúmus*, or, in other words, is an analogical creation according to the strong form *sumus*. Whatever opinion may be held with reference to these special types, we cannot derive the imperfect *aimais* from *amabam*, but from **amēbam*, that is, it follows the analogy of *punissais* = **puniscēbam*, and this again must be referred to *sentais* = **sentēbam*, for *sentēbam*.

From these few examples it will be readily seen what a thorough scientific

discipline has been able to do for us in the treatment of this most complicated grammar category, and if such difficulties arise for the so-called regular verbs, how much more intricate do the conditions become for the irregular verb system.

Here, however, to simplify matters, we have no full strong conjugation, in the strict sense of the term, but only strong flexional forms in certain tenses.

In a statement of the scope of phrase-building and the relation of syntax to logic, the author traces the main characteristics of the Neo-Latin sentence, and adds some valuable remarks on the history of Romance syntax, which he divides into two periods, namely: (1) that before the influence of the Classic Latin models was felt upon the literary form, and (2) after the educated writers began to imitate the Latin style. Here we find a stricter, more logical construction, with a high development often of the rhetorical element, while in the former a great liberty of phrase-setting is maintained, that enables the writer to pass easily from one mode of construction to another according as it suited his thought.

For the second part of this volume the author reviews the various systems of sound notation that have been proposed in Romance, especially those of Boehmer, Ascoli and Trautmann, then sketches the history of the earliest editions of the older literature, and lays down the canons in accordance with which a sound text criticism must be carried out, and finally considers briefly the various literary forms that have been used in the Neo-Latin idioms from the earliest periods down to the present time.

One of the most important features of this valuable work is the abundant bibliographical notices that accompany almost every section of it. With these and with the lucid exposition of theory and principle, the neat tracings of history and literary form, with the bold outlining of the subject as a whole, the young worker in Romance languages may trust himself to his enthusiasm in the assurance that, if he follows the method here laid down, he will in time attain rich results. The book cannot be too highly recommended, especially to those in the early stages of their work.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Ueber tragische Schuld und Sühne. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Aesthetik des Dramas. Von Dr. JULIUS GOEBEL. Berlin, 1884.

It seems not unfitting that this conservative and able essay, on the history and theory of the modern German drama, should have been written by a German-American, full of the German ideal, and inclined to believe that it will determine the future of all the nations of Teutonic race.

The strangely checkered history of this highest branch of composition in Germany is, in its darker portions, the history of an unwise and uncensored cosmopolitanism. We are prepared to find the theory of an objective critic like Otto Ludwig culminating in the sentence: "Alles Wesentliche in der tragischen Composition lässt sich schon in einem detaillirten, gründlichen Vergleiche der antiken und der Shakespeare'schen Tragödie entwickeln und darstellen"; for he rightly claims Shakespeare as a part of the common Germanic inheritance. We are even prepared to find the same critic, with